



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/091,513	03/07/2002	Dean Moses	VIGN1690-1	8808
44654	7590	11/29/2011	EXAMINER	
Sprinkle IP Law Group 1301 W. 25th Street Suite 408 Austin, TX 78705			STRANGE, AARON N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2448	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/29/2011 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/091,513	Applicant(s) MOSES ET AL.	
	Examiner AARON STRANGE	Art Unit 2448	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 August 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1.4.6-14, 17, 19-27, 30-34 and 36-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1.4.6-14, 17, 19-27, 30-34 and 36-45 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to all pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 4, 6-11, 14, 17, 19-24, 27, 30-34, 36, 37, 40, 41, 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nesamoney et al. (US 6,044,374).

4. With regard to claim 1, Nesamoney discloses a method of sharing an object in a portal framework, the method comprising the steps of:

providing a first site (Data Mart 1)(fig. 2, 201), wherein the first site comprises a first collection of objects (Data Marts contain objects)(col. 5, ll. 16-24);

assigning a share privilege at the first site to a first user to allow the first user to share a first object from the first collection of objects with another site (users associated

with the Data Marts may obtain write privileges to share objects in the folders of the global repository)(col. 6, ll. 45-55);

storing a reference to the object in a first repository in the portal framework (a reference to each shared object is maintained in the Data Mart)(col. 9, ll. 26-66), wherein the first repository is associated with or available to the first site on the portal framework (Data Mart 1 contains the first repository), wherein the first repository resides on a machine comprising a processor and a data store in the portal framework (repositories are in mass storage of server 107)(col. 3, l. 64 to col. 4, l. 16), and wherein the reference to the object contains information for accessing the object (object references points to the object)(col. 5, ll. 9-12);

providing a second site (Data Mart 2)(fig. 2, 202), wherein the second site comprises a second collection of objects stored in a second repository(Data Marts contain objects)(col. 5, ll. 16-24);;

assigning a second privilege at the second site to a second user, wherein the second privilege allows the second user to access objects in the second repository (users associated with the Data Marts may obtain read privileges to access objects in the folders of the global repository and their associated date mart)(col. 6, ll. 45-55; col. 7, ll. 11-25);

performing a first operation to store a duplicate of the reference to the object in the second repository associated with or available to the second site on the portal framework based on the first privilege (references to shared objects may be copied to other Data Marts)(col. 7, l. 60 to col. 8, l. 4), wherein the second repository resides on a

machine comprising a processor and a data store (repositories are in mass storage of server 107)(col. 3, l. 64 to col. 4, l. 16); and

allowing the second user to view the duplicate of the reference to the object based on the second privilege (users with read access may view and access reference duplicates in their local Data Mart)(col. 7, ll. 64-66);

wherein, via the duplicate of the reference stored in the second repository, the object becomes available to the second site for reuse by the second site on the portal framework (users with read access may view and access reference duplicates in their local Data Mart, thereby obtaining access to the object)(col. 7, ll. 64-66); and

wherein the first operation is in accordance with the share privilege (only users with write access can share objects by modifying the folders in the global repository)(col. 6, ll. 50-55); and

wherein the first and second privilege are granted independent of the reference to the object, the duplicate of the reference of the object and the object (privileges are granted to users, and are not object-specific)(col. 6, ll. 50-55).

5. With regard to claim 4, Nesamoney further discloses performing a second operation to unshared the object with the second site, wherein the second operation removes the duplicate of the reference of the object from the second repository (objects may be deleted from the shared folders)(col. 7, ll. 11-25).

6. With regard to claim 6, Nesamoney further discloses that the share privilege assigned to the first site allows the first site to store a reference to the object in a shared repository (users associated with the Data Marts may obtain write privileges to share objects in the folders of the global repository)(col. 6, ll. 45-55), wherein the second privilege assigned to the second site allows the second user to access the shared repository to view the duplicate of the reference to the object (users associated with the Data Marts may obtain read privileges to access objects in the folders of the global repository and their associated date mart)(col. 6, ll. 45-55; col. 7, ll. 11-25).

7. With regard to claim 6, Nesamoney further discloses assigning a third privilege to a third user, wherein the third privilege allows the third user to access objects in the second repository; and allowing the third user to view the duplicate of the reference to the object based on the third privilege, wherein the first, second and third privileges are granted independent of the reference to the object, the duplicate of the object and the object (multiple users may obtain permission to access objects in the shared repository)(col. 6, l. 44 to col. 7, l. 10).

8. With regard to claim 8, Nesamoney further discloses performing a second operation to store a second duplicate of the reference to the object in a third repository (references may appear in multiple repositories)(col. 7, ll. 64-66).

9. With regard to claim 9, Nesamoney further discloses performing a third operation to add the object to the second site (shared objects may be copied to the unshared folders)(col. 5, ll. 47-50).

10. With regard to claim 10, Nesamoney further discloses performing a fourth operation to remove the duplicate of the reference of the object from the second repository (references to objects are removed when a shared object is deleted)(col. 7, ll. 11-25).

11. With regard to claim 11, Nesamoney further discloses that the fourth operation further comprises the step of removing the object from the second site (objects may be deleted from local repositories)(col. 7, ll. 11-25).

12. Claims 14, 17, 19-24, 27, 30-34, 36, 37, 40, 41, 43 and 44 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1, 4 and 6-11, since they recite substantially identical subject matter. Any differences between the claims do not result in patentably distinct claims and all of the limitations are explicitly or inherently taught by the above cited art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 12, 13, 25, 26, 38, 39 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nesamoney et al. (US 6,044,374) in view of Dysart et al. (US 5,899,996).

15. With regard to claims 12 and 13, while the system disclosed by Nesamoney shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose selectively storing or excluding references to each child object of the object in the second repository.

Dysart discloses a similar system for data management (col. 1, ll. 14-15). Dysart teaches selectively copying child objects when a parent object is copied (col. 5, ll. 50-60). This would have been an advantageous addition to the system disclosed by Nesamoney since it would have allowed child objects to be selectively copied to the shared folders based on the type of child objects, permitting them to be shared via references to the shared folder if desired.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to permit child objects to be copied to the shared folder and permitting those objects to be accessed via references as desired by the file originator.

16. Claims 25, 26, 38, 39 and 42 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 12 and 13, since they recite substantially identical subject matter. Any differences between the claims do not result in patentably distinct claims and all of the limitations are explicitly or inherently taught by the above cited art.

17. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nesamoney et al. (US 6,044,374) in view of Dan et al. (US 6,560,639).

18. With regard to claim 45, while the system disclosed by Nesamoney shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that the object comprises a style object providing code that controls display elements of a web site.

Dan discloses that style objects were well known in the art at the time the invention was made (col. 16, l. 60-19). These types of objects were used to contain style sheets for defining characteristics of a web site. This would have been an advantageous type of object to share using Nesamoney's system since it would have permitted each department of a business to obtain the style objects without locally duplicating them and ensured consistency of the style objects used by each department.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to share style objects that control display elements of a

web site to permit multiple departments of a business to share the same style objects, ensuring consistency of a business's web site across departments.

Conclusion

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AARON STRANGE whose telephone number is (571)272-3959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on 571-272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aaron Strange/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2448